



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/788,732

02/27/2004

Lce D. Saathoff

EI-7624

6113

34769 7590 09/24/2007
NEW MARKET SERVICES CORPORATION
(FORMERLY ETHYL CORPORATION)
330 SOUTH 4TH STREET
RICHMOND, VA 23219

EXAMINER

GOLOBOY, JAMES C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/788,732

Applicant(s)

SAATHOFF ET AL.

Examiner

James Goloboy

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1 and 20, and their dependent claims, have been amended to incorporate the limitation that the tertiary amine is present in an amount "from about" 0.5% by weight. There is no support for this range in the application as originally filed, only a range of between 0.5 and 1.5% by weight.

The rejections set forth below are applicable both in the case where the new limitation is given weight, and in the case where the new limitation is not given weight.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Art Unit: 1714

applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 20, and their dependent claims, have been amended to incorporate the limitation that the tertiary amine is present in an amount "from about" 0.5% by weight. The scope of the claim is indefinite, as the upper endpoint of the required concentration range is not clear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

5. Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Izumi (U.S. Pat. No. 3,720,615).

In the case that the new limitation of claim 1 regarding the tertiary amine is not given weight, the rejection of the claims as anticipated by Izumi is adequately set forth in paragraph 1 of the office action mailed 4/5/07.

In the case that the new limitation is given weight, it is noted that Izumi teaches in column 2 lines 54-61 that the rust preventive composition comprises from 5 to 95% by weight of the tertiary amine, and is used in an amount in the range of 0.001 to 3% by weight of an overall lubricating composition. The concentration of tertiary amine therefore overlaps the range recited in amended claim 1. See MPEP 2144.05(I): "In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976);" The claims are therefore rendered obvious by Izumi.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowe (U.S. Pat. No. 4,177,153).

The rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 2 of the office action mailed 4/5/07.

7. Claims 13, 15-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowe in view of Ohtani (U.S. Pat. No. 5,344,579).

The rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 3 of the office action mailed 4/5/07.

8. Claims 14, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowe in view of Watts (U.S. Pat. No. 6,225,266).

The rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 4 of the office action mailed 4/5/07.

9. Claims 20-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowe in view of Papay (U.S. Pat. No. 4,795,583) and Field (U.S. Pat. No. 6,844,301).

The rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 5 of the office action mailed 4/5/07.

Art Unit: 1714

10. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowe in view of Papay and Field as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Ohtani.

The rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 6 of the office action mailed 4/5/07.

11. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowe in view of Papay and Field as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Watts.

The rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 7 of the office action mailed 4/5/07.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments regarding Lowe have already been addressed in paragraph 8 of the office action mailed 4/5/07, which is incorporated here by reference.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1714

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Goloboy whose telephone number is 571-272-2476. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/788,732

Page 7

Art Unit: 1714

James C. Goloboy
JCG

/Vasu Jagannathan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700